



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,049	10/23/2003	Wei Wu	M61.12-0984	7260
27366 7590 07/18/2008 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244				
EXAMINER				
WU, JUNCHUN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2191				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,049

Applicant(s)

WU ET AL.

Examiner

JUNCHUN WU

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-18, 20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-18, 20 and 21 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination filed on Apr. 29, 2008.
2. Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20, and 21 are pending in this application.
3. Claims 1 and 18 have been amended.
4. Claim 6 has been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-16, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rettig et al. (US Patent No. 6,252,589 B1, hereinafter "Rettig"), in view of Bennett et al. (US Pub. No. 20020052910 A1, hereinafter "Bennett").

7. Per claim 1 (Currently amended)

Rettig discloses

A method for creating language-neutral and corresponding language-specific resource files for a component, the method comprising:

- obtaining a resource manifest file (col.3 lines 2-7 "This operating system provides separate text files for each language. When a process requires a text file resource in a

particular language, the operating system addresses the appropriate file. The user can select his default language of choice through a system variable.”).

- creating a language-neutral file and a language-specific resource file having a plurality of language-specific resources by reading localizable resource information contained in the resource manifest file, the localizable resource information specifying location of specific resource to be retrieved (Col.4 lines 56-62 *“An operating system scheme provides resource-handling components that provide features for handling multiple-language resources without requiring any specific directions from the processes requesting the resources.”* & Col.6 lines 3-14 *“The resource loader (or library loader) algorithm that generates alternate-language resources should be able to deal with situations where only an approximation to the requested language is available...”*) during runtime from the language-specific resource file, the locations of the specific resources being mapped to resource identifiers used by applications to identify the specific resource within the language-specific resource file (col.5 lines 11-22 *“...The generation of the path may be in response to a resource identifier and an optional module handle provided by the process requesting the resource and also in response to a system-wide operating user-setting specifying a chosen language for the user-interface...”*), in the resource manifest file, the resource manifest file further specifying, a type of resource to be retrieved, and indicating whether the resource is localizable (col.9 lines 3-4 *“A process 310 requests a memory handle for a resource by sending to a resource finder 320 a resource name and type.”*).

But Rettig does not disclose

- creating a checksum data and updating a field in the resource manifest file with the checksum data

However, Bennett discloses

- creating a checksum data ([0036] *“During the generation of the checksum, code and version information are excluded in the generation process, because a resource module may be updated with changes to its code or version number without any change to the resource content.”*)
- updating a field in the resource manifest file with the checksum data ([0051] *“If, at decision block 230, it was determined that the checksums do not match, routine 200 proceeds to block 234. Because the checksum values did not match, the resources have been modified in the default resource module 76.”*).
- Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teaching of Rettig with the teachings of Bennett to include creating a checksum data and updating a field in the resource manifest file with the checksum data in order to provide a way to compare different resources and determine the current default resource module is compatible with the resource module from which alternate resource module were localized using checksum data ([0050]).

8. Per claim 2 (Original)

the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Rettig further discloses

- The resource manifest file is specified (col.9 lines 11-15, *“...It is also possible for the process to request a resource that is language-specific”*).

9. Per claim 3 (Original)

the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Rettig further discloses

- The resource manifest file is not specified and a default resource manifest file is used (col.10 lines 45-50, “*Other steps, which may be placed in any desired priority, could be the selection of a default alternate language resource subdirectory, a substitute language where the one specified by the user language ID is not available but a fair substitute language spoken in the likely locale is.*”).

10. Per claim 5 (Original)

the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Rettig further discloses

- The localizable resource information resides in a compacted resource file (col.10 lines 3-6, “*...The element <language_ID> may be some compact code representing the language.*”).

11. Per claim 7 (Previously Amended)

the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Rettig further discloses

The method of claim 1 wherein creating comprises: reading the localizable resource information from the resource manifest file, by reading a plurality of data fields comprising:

- a third data field containing data representing language dependency of the user interface resource element of the second data field (col.5 lines 17-22 “*...also in response to a*

system-wide operating user-setting specifying a chosen language for the user-interface.”).

- a fourth data field containing data representing an element associated with a user interface resource type (col.4 lines 62-65 “*a user is enabled to select a language for the user interface and the resource loader will automatically redirect calls for resources to the appropriate resources.*”).

But Rettig does not disclose

- a first data field containing data representing an element indicating the schema contains resource localization information and a second data field containing data representing an element associated with a user interface resource.

However, Bennett discloses

- a first data field containing data representing an element indicating the schema contains resource localization information ([0012] “*The resource loader obtains the resource content of the default resource module from which the alternate resource module was localized.*”).
- a second data field containing data representing an element associated with a user interface resource ([0004] “*to facilitate use of the common user interface in different countries/regions, the user interface should support multiple languages.*”).
- Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teaching of Rettig with the teachings of Bennett to include a first data field containing data representing an element indicating the schema contains resource localization information and a second data field containing data

representing an element associated with a user interface resource in order to provide a method for dynamically verifying whether the resource content of a resource module is compatible with the most current version of operating system ([0011]).

12. Per claim 8 (Previously Amended)

the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and Bennett further discloses

- the second data field represents unmanaged resources ([0046] *“The compatibility information field is used to store a false value if the resource content of the current default resource module is not compatible with the resource content of the default resource module from which the alternate resource module was localized.”*).

13. Per claim 9 (Currently Amended)

the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and Bennett further discloses

- the second data field represents managed resources ([0046] *“The compatibility information field is used to store a true value if the resource content of the current default resource module is compatible with the resource content of the default resource module from which the alternate resource module was localized.”*).

14. Per claim 10 (Previously Amended)

the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and Rettig further discloses

- the third data field represents language-neutral resources (col.6 lines 27-28 *“...Alternatively, a language-neutral alternate resource module may be invoked.”*).

15. Per claim 11 (Previously Amended)

the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and Rettig further discloses

- the third data field represents localized resources (col.3 lines 10-11 “*A system variable is defined indicating the locale*”).

16. Per claim 12 (Previously Amended)

the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and Rettig further discloses

wherein reading the plurality of fields comprises reading:

- a fifth data field containing data representing a file path of a resource file of the user interface resource element of the second data field (col.6 lines 15-18 “*algorithm may determine if, in the module path specified by “<module_path>” there exists a subdirectory with an identifier equivalent to the current user language ID...*”).
- a sixth data field containing data representing a file path type of the file path (col.6 lines 15-18).
- a seventh data field containing data representing a file type of the resource file (col.4 lines 11-13 “*The resource type may specify for example a bitmap, an animated cursor, a font resource, a menu resource, a string-table entry, etc.*”).

17. Per claim 13 (Previously Amended)

the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and Rettig further discloses

- wherein reading the plurality of fields further comprises reading an eighth data field containing data representing an indication of whether to reference a default resource

manifest (col.10 lines 45-47 “*Other steps, which may be placed in any desired priority, could be the selection of a default alternate language resource subdirectory...*”).

18. Per claim 14 (Previously Amended)

the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and Bennett further discloses wherein reading the plurality of fields further comprises reading:

- a ninth data field containing data representing a file name of a compacted resource file ([0035] “*a record containing an application name field*”).
- a tenth data field containing data representing a file version of the compacted resource file ([0035] “*an alternate resource module version field, a default resource module version field, and a resource compatibility field*”).
- an eleventh data field containing data representing an index value of a resource localization file within the compacted resource file ([0044] “*To facilitate searching, the resource loader 72 can use an index on the registry resource version database 74 where the version number of the alternate resource module is a key field.*”)

19. Per claim 15 (Previously Amended)

the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and Bennett further discloses wherein reading the plurality of fields further comprises reading:

- a twelfth data field containing data representing a file version of a resource file ([0035] “*an alternate resource module version field, a default resource module version field, and a resource compatibility field*”).

- a thirteenth data field containing data representing a checksum value ([0037] “*The values returned from a hashing routine are generally described as checksums.*”).

20. Per claim 16 (Previously Amended)

the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and Bennett further discloses

wherein reading the plurality of fields further comprises reading:

- a fourteenth data field containing data representing a name of the element associated with the user interface resource type of the fourth data field ([0031] “*causes the visual elements associated with the user interface of the operating system to be displayed on the monitor.*”).
- a fifteenth data field containing data representing an identifier of the element associated with the user interface resource type of the fourth data field ([0041] “*Generally described, in an MUI-based operating system, a designated user interface language is specified and the resource loader attempts to load some or all resources from corresponding alternate resource modules*”).
- a sixteenth data field containing data representing a name of a resource item ([0006] “*a resource is an item of data or code that is shared by multiple programs or in more than one place in a program, such as a dialog box, a sound effect, or a font in a windowed environment.*”).
- a seventeenth data field containing data representing an identifier of the resource item ([0037] “*a hashing routine is utilized to provide a unique numerical identifier of the contents of the resource files.*”).

21. Per claim 18 (Currently Amended)

Rettig discloses

A method for a component owner to provide component resource localization information, the method comprising:

- determining localizable resources (col.3 lines 11-16 “*A system variable is defined indicating the locale (Note, the locale of a system is not a language setting. Locale is a mixture of language and location) of the operating system installation and this variable can be used by the applications running on the operating system to format messages specifically for the current language.*”).
- determining a localizable resource folder convention (col.4 lines 3-6 “*The resource module handle, which indicates where the resource datum, specified by the resource name, can be found, is created by the resource finder. The resource name, type, and a language (the latter is optional) are provided to the resource finder 135 which returns a resource module handle.*”).
- creating a resource manifest file (col.3 lines 8-18 “*at least one current operating system (Windows) provides some support for the creation of language-specific libraries, for example text messages*”).
- The resource manifest file mapping locations of specific resources to be retrieve during runtime, within the language-specific resource file that has a plurality of language-specific resource, to resource identifiers used by an application to identify the specific resource (col.5 lines 11-22 “*...The generation of the path may be in response to a*

resource identifier and an optional module handle provided by the process requesting the resource and also in response to a system-wide operating user-setting specifying a chosen language for the user-interface...").

- specifying a path for the resource manifest file, according to the resource folder convention, to a resource compiler program (col.5 lines 46-52).

22. Per claim 21 (Original)

the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated and Rettig further discloses

- the localizable resource information resides in a compacted resource file (col.10 lines 3-6“...*The element <language_ID> may be some compact code representing the language.*”).

23. Claims 4, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Rettig, in view of Bennett, and further view of Wilkinson et al. (US Patent No. 7,7007,026 B2, hereafter “Wilkinson”).

24. Per claims 4,17, and 20

Rettig and Bennett do not disclose

- the resource manifest file is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) based declarative file.

But Wilkinson discloses

- the resource manifest file is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) based declarative file (col.2 lines 32-37).

- Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teachings of Rettig and Bennett and further include the resource manifest file is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) based declarative file by the teaching of Wilkinson in order to incorporate localized values from the XML file in an output page, such as an HTML help page and combine other application data that is supplied by the application as an XML file (Wilkinson, col.14 lines 50-52 & lines 59-60).

Response to Arguments

25. Applicant's arguments filed on Apr. 29 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- In the remarks, Applicant argues that:

With regard to claims 1 and 18, applicant respectfully submits currently amended claims that cited portion does not disclose or suggest.

Examiner's response:

Examiner disagrees. With respect to claim 1 which is similar to claim 18, Examiner finds other portion of Rettig which implicitly interpreted the method includes "creating a language-neutral file and a language-specific resource file having a plurality of language-specific resources by reading localizable resource information contained in the resource manifest file, the localizable resource information specifying locations of specific resources to be retrieved during runtime from the language-specific resource file, the locations of the specific resources being mapped to resource identifiers used by applications to identify the specific resources within the language-

specific resource file, in the resource manifest file, the resource manifest file further specifying a type of resource to be retrieved, and indicating whether the resource is localizable" — (Col.4 lines 56-62 *"An operating system scheme provides resource-handling components that provide features for handling multiple-language resources without requiring any specific directions from the processes requesting the resources."* & Col.6 lines 3-14 *"The resource loader (or library loader) algorithm that generates alternate-language resources should be able to deal with situations where only an approximation to the requested language is available..."* & Col.5 lines 11-22 *"...The generation of the path may be in response to a resource identifier and an optional module handle provided by the process requesting the resource and also in response to a system-wide operating user-setting specifying a chosen language for the user-interface..."* & Col.9 lines 3-4 *"A process 310 requests a memory handle for a resource by sending to a resource finder 320 a resource name and type.").*

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Junchun Wu whose telephone number is 571-270-1250. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-17:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.¹

Art Unit: 2191

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JW

/Wei Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191